

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/036,454	01/07/2002	Shoji Nishikawa	05905.0155	4922	
22852 7590 01/24/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER		
			VAN HANDE	VAN HANDEL, MICHAEL P	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	, 20 2001 1112		2623		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/036,454	NISHIKAWA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Michael Van Handel	2623		

	Michael Van Handel	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 December 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in a	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7			si adamatan sah
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	e appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS	t i to to the line of the control of	will and he and sould be	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		mpliant Amandment	(PTOL-324)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		Ampliant Amendment	(F10L-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will will not be entered, or b) ☐ will will will be wi	ll be entered and an o	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Attached.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. X Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.		Q Xell	>
		CHRIS KELLEY	

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 11.

Regarding claims 32-35, the applicant argues that Nishikawa et al. does not teach or suggest a selection screen of the received content. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Nishikawa et al. discloses an integrated receiver 12 that receives a direct satellite broadcast signal (col. 3, I. 61-66). A direct broadcast satellite system (DSS) processing element 200 periodically downloads large amounts of data, including program guide information, web sites for caching, firmware updates, etc. (col. 6, I. 52-56). Multiple Graphical User Interface (GUI) screens are generated to allow a user to select content received by the integrated receiver 12 (col. 10, I. 36-67; col. 11, I. 1-13, 30-67; col. 12, I. 1-18, 50-64; col. 14, I. 15-39; & Figs. 7, 12, 13). Thus, the examiner maintains that Nishikawa et al. discloses "a selection screen of the received content," as claimed.

Regarding claims 32-35, the applicant argues that the combination of Nishikawa et al. and Blackwell et al. does not teach or suggest when the receiving means is receiving data regarding a content to be updated, the display means performs display processing to display a selection screen of the content to be updated in a different manner from a selection screen of other received content and further argues that Nishikawa et al. does not teach or suggest a method for displaying ... a selection screen of the content to be updated in a different manner from a selection screen of the other received content while receiving data regarding the content to be updated. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the applicant argues that Blackwell et al. does not teach or suggest when the receiving means is receiving data regarding a content to be updated, the display means performs display processing to display a selection screen of the content to be updated in a different manner from a selection screen of other received content and further argues that Blackwell et al. fails to teach or suggest a method for displaying ... a selection screen of the content to be updated in a different manner from a selection screen of the other received content while receiving data regarding the content to be updated.

Nishikawa et al. discloses multiple GUI screens that allow a user to select content received by an integrated receiver 12 (col. 10, I. 36-67; col. 11, I. 1-13, 30-67; col. 12, I. 1-18, 50-64; col. 14, I. 15-39; & Figs. 7, 12, 13). Nishikawa et al. further discloses displaying a selectable scolling ticker region that displays information about upcoming events (e.g. upcoming pay-per-view movies, sporting scores, stocks, etc.)(col. 10, I. 48-50; col. 11, I. 62-67; col. 12, I. 1-18; & Figs. 7, 9). The examiner notes that this selectable scrolling ticker region is displayed in a different manner from a selection screen of the other received content (other types of content & GUI layouts as cited above), as currently claimed. As noted by the examiner in the previous Office Action, Nishikawa et al. fails to disclose that the different display processing of the selectable scrolling ticker region is performed regarding a content to be updated. Blackwell et al. discloses distributing continuously updated sports information such as game scores and statistics, weather information such as storm alerts and national and local forecasts, news information such as news wire feeds, stock quotes, etc. (col. 14, I. 45-56). Thus, the combination of Nishikawa et al. and Blackwell et al. teaches displaying information in a selectable scrolling ticker in a different manner from other content when/while information in the scrolling ticker is continuously updated. Therefore, the examiner maintains that the combination of Nishikawa et al. and Blackwell et al. teaches when the receiving means is receiving data regarding a content to be updated, the display means performs display processing to display a selection screen of the content to be updated in a different manner from a selection screen of other received content, as currently claimed, and further teaches a method for displaying ... a selection screen of the content to be updated in a different manner from a selection screen of the other received content while receiving data regarding the content to be updated, as currently claimed. The examiner further maintains that it be obvious to combine Nishikawa et al. and Blackwell et al. in order to keep a viewer up to date on the score of a game that changes very frequently, such as a basketball game.